THEOLOGY

VOL. LVII APRIL, 1954 No. 406

Editorial Notes

DURING the first three weeks of April the Editor will be abroad and unable to attend to correspondence.

* * * * *

It is disappointing that the writing of Cardinal Gasquet's life was not entrusted to an author who might have matched the riches of the sources placed at his disposal and the intrinsic importance of his subject with an adequate biography. Sir Shane Leslie is of course an accomplished *raconteur*, and his *Cardinal Gasquet* (Burns Oates, 21s.) makes a pleasant piece of light reading. Gasquet was deeply and variously involved in the ecclesiastical history of his time. He played a more or less prominent part in the restoration of the Benedictine Order in England, the controversy about Anglican orders in the 1890s, the historiography of the Reformation and its antecedents, the preparation of a new official edition of the Vulgate, and the representation of British interests at the Vatican during the First World War. Sir Shane's book deals with, and indeed sheds fresh light on, all these matters as well as Gasquet's relations with Edmund Bishop and the affair of the succession to the Archbishopric of Westminster in 1903. There is much to interest the ecclesiastical historian, but the result is disappointing. No topic is treated thoroughly. The general effect is slap-dash and sketchy. Much unpublished material is quoted from Gasquet's papers, though Sir Shane confesses that he has used only a tithe of them. What is quoted deserves a better informed and more detailed commentary, and an author who can annotate obscure allusions in letters, etc. A suitably qualified Roman Catholic scholar might have produced an historical biography that would deserve a place alongside some of the revealing works that are now being produced on the continent about comparatively recent personalities and events.[1] An opportunity has been lost.

With regard to the vexed question of Gasquet as *verax historicus*, Sir Shane not only does not pretend to furnish an answer; he simply avoids the issue with a few polite pleasantries and fatuous platitudes. Here particularly, though also in other parts of his biography, as in the relations of Gasquet with Bourne, Sir Shane makes little use of the private papers of his subject. There cannot be room for a further Life of Gasquet for a considerable time to come; and it is therefore

[1] E.g. A. Simon's *Le Cardinal Sterckx et son temps* (1950) and R. Aubert's *Le pontificat de Pie IX* (1952).

the greater pity that the duty of commemorating him was not entrusted to more competent hands.

It cannot even be said that Sir Shane Leslie brings Gasquet to life as a striking personality. He must have had positively attractive features but they do not stand out clearly enough in this book to compensate for his obvious defects. Even the anecdotes that are recorded are without savour, and although Sir Shane introduces some of Gasquet's letters with the remark that they are "full of sallies and wit and shrewd little asides" we must confess we have failed to discover these agreeable qualities in them.

* * * * *

One of the best agencies (if that is the right word) that the Church of England possesses is the C. of E. Moral Welfare Council. We are not enamoured of its title, though it is difficult to suggest a more satisfactory one. Its sub-title, which very well indicates what it does, is of course impossibly long for ordinary use: "The Central Council of the Church for the co-ordination of thought and action in relation to sex, marriage and the family in the Christian life." Its quarterly review, *Moral Welfare*,[1] contains articles and book reviews on that broad range of subjects, and deserves to be better known and more widely read than it is at present. The Council also produces some excellent and inexpensive booklets. We specially commend two of its recent publications: *The Theological Study of Sex and Marriage* (1s.), which is a bibliography of the subject prepared by Dr Sherwin Bailey; and *The Problem of Homosexuality* (2s. 6d.), which is an interim report by a group of clergy and doctors, dealing with aspects of the question that have lately been the subject of much public discussion. A fuller and more comprehensive report by the same group is in course of preparation. The interim report shows that there is a strong case for the appointment of a Royal Commission or a similar form of official inquiry.

* * * * *

The *Pitt Minion Reference Bible*, which is available in 29 different styles ranging in price from 13s. 6d. to 67s. 6d., is a splendid piece of printing by the Cambridge University Press. Alternative readings and references to parallel passages are given in a centre column, and a method of enumeration has been adopted which frees the text itself from distracting figures, letters or numbers. Anyone wanting to give a Bible as a present or a prize should certainly consider this edition.

* * * * *

We gladly call attention to the Clergy Vacation Courses to be held at St Augustine's College, Canterbury, during July and August this year, of which a notice appears elsewhere in this issue.

[1] 2s. 6d. per annum, post free, from C. of E. Moral Welfare Council, Church House, London, S.W.1.

Revisions of the Eucharistic Rite in the Anglican Communion

THE Anglican Communion possesses two families of Eucharistic Liturgy. The first stems from Cramner's 1552 rite and its history has been paradoxical. Cranmer drastically reshaped what he apparently regarded as the interim rite of 1549 for two reasons, one theological and one practical. The first was to exclude the doctrine of the Real Presence in any form, to eliminate the idea of even a commemorative sacrifice in the Eucharist, and to provide a Liturgy which in its language should express his own views about the Lord's Supper—views which, if more positive than those of Zwingli, yet "moved within the basic framework of Zwingli's opinions".[1] The second would seem to have been to provide worshippers with a Liturgy which in its structure should have immediately after the Words of Institution a devotional climax which could replace the medieval climax of the Adoration of the Elevated Host at that point. Hence the so-called dislocation of the Canon and the placing of Communion with its accompanying act of mental remembrance of the Passion between the narrative of the Institution and the Prayer of Oblation.

The paradox arises from the fact that the Church of England, except for the short eight months between the authorization of the 1552 rite and the death of Edward VI, has never been committed to Cranmer's doctrine. The changes in 1559, though few, were significant; "the 39 Articles represent, in Eucharistic doctrine, a rejection of some of his views";[2] and with the Caroline divines a fuller and richer Eucharistic theology found a place once more in Anglicanism. The 1662 rite was designed to be expressive of this fuller Eucharistic outlook as well as of the views of those who it was at first hoped might be retained within the Establishment, and this rite still remains the only fully authorized rite in the Church of England and a number of her daughter-churches to-day. That this is so is due to a variety of causes. First, the sheer power and beauty of Cranmer's liturgical style has had its own effect and, at any rate outside the Canon, many of his rearrangements of 1549 have proved themselves in experience. Secondly, the loss of the Nonjurors deprived the Church of England of the group from which a movement for a richer Eucharistic Liturgy might have come; the prevailing interests of the eighteenth century lay elsewhere. Thirdly, the truth must be faced, so far as the Church of England is concerned, that, as 1927 and 1928 showed, we have so far been unable to agree sufficiently on an alternative to win the assent of Parliament to a change.

The other family of Eucharistic rites stems from the ill-fated Scottish Liturgy of 1637. This rite was mainly the work of James Wedderburn, Bishop of Dunblane, and was finally accepted and approved by Archbishop Laud. In this Liturgy the Consecration

[1] C. C. Richardson, *Zwingli and Cranmer on the Eucharist*, p. 48.
[2] Op. cit, p. 1.

Prayer was substantially a return to 1549, with the 1552 petition for worthy reception added to the Invocation of the Holy Spirit.[1] As a result of the practice of Scottish Nonjuring bishops in the eighteenth century, however, the Epiclesis (shorn of the 1552 addition) appeared after the Anamnesis in the Scottish Liturgy of 1764. From Scotland this type of Consecration Prayer passed to the American Episcopal Church; the Liturgy of the Church of the Province of South Africa belongs to the same family.

There is no doubt that the Church of England must sooner or later have a Liturgy in the same classical pattern. For the fact must be faced that the structure of 1662 is not that of the great Liturgies of Christendom and, as the Church of South India has shown, no Church laying liturgical foundations for the first time can be expected to follow it. Its interruption of the flow from Sanctus to Consecration Prayer, its lack of Eucharistic beginning to that prayer, its omission of the Anamnesis with its emphasis on the Resurrection and Exaltation of Christ as well as on his Death, and its misplacing of the petition for worthy reception—these are grave defects which cannot be allowed to continue indefinitely. To-day we have—perhaps for the first time—the opportunity of going behind sixteenth-century controversies and medieval abuses and of recovering afresh the classical pattern of Eucharistic worship with its "four-action" shape and of revising our Liturgy accordingly. When the revision of the Canons is completed, we must take that opportunity.

These reflections are stirred by the fact that recently four branches at least of the Anglican Communion have published revisions of the Eucharistic rite either for study or for experimental use. These rites will require the expert consideration and judgment of liturgiologists, but meanwhile it may be of interest if some account of them is generally available, particularly as the subject of Anglican worship is one of the subjects for the Congress at Minneapolis this summer. They show how other branches of our Communion are reaching out after a fuller Eucharistic Liturgy in ways which may well have much to teach us in England.

The first revision with which this article will be concerned is that of the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon. There the Episcopal Synod has authorized a complete revision of the Book of Common Prayer for experimental use. This revision, called "A Proposed Prayer Book", was reviewed in THEOLOGY, November 1953 (cf. also a letter in THEOLOGY, January 1954).

The book contains three Eucharistic rites—the Holy Eucharist with which this article will be concerned; 1662 called the Communion; and a Liturgy for India, based on the model of Eastern Liturgies, which is substantially the diocesan rite of Bombay. The Holy Eucharist is prefaced with fifteen general rubrics. These author-

[1] Linton in *Twenty-Five Consecration Prayers* for some reason printed the 1637 Canon, not in its original form, but in the version which was used and subsequently printed (unofficially) in the eighteenth century.

ize the present variety of vesture; require that the celebrant shall speak audibly and that in reading the Epistle and Gospel "the Minister shall so stand and turn himself, as he may best be heard of the people"; explain the traditional usage about collect endings; allow prayers for the departed to be omitted where there are conscientious difficulties; and permit Reservation under the direction of the Ordinary for the sick and others unable to be present.

The Preparation (Ps. 43, etc.) is printed with the Confession in both the joint and mutual forms. This may be said aloud with the congregation on week-days in place of the later Confession, Absolution, and Comfortable Words. Introit psalms are provided for every Sunday and Holy Day. The Ten Commandments (in the shortened form) must be read one Sunday in every month; otherwise the Lord's Summary or the Kyries—threefold or ninefold, in the vernacular or Greek—may be used.

In the next section, "The Ministry of the Word", the Nicene Creed is only required on Sundays and Feast Days and its translation is improved in three places—"*through* whom all things were made", "the Holy Ghost, The Lord, *The* Giver of Life", and "One *Holy*, Catholic and Apostolic Church".

The Offertory begins with the sentence "Let us present our offerings to the Lord with reverence and godly fear." Then follow eleven general sentences (the financial ones so prominent in 1662 are conspicuous by their absence) and nineteen special sentences, suitable for the Church's year or particular occasions. The rubrics specifically identify "oblations" in the Prayer for the Church with the bread and wine and advocate that on Sundays and Feast Days they be brought up by two members of the congregation from the midst of the congregation. At the placing of the oblations and alms on the altar the priest may say 1 Chron. 29. 10–12, "Blessed be thou . . ."

The Indian Church has not unnaturally felt an incongruity in including petitions for rulers who may well be Hindus or Moslems in the Prayer for the Church, and so has provided a bidding for them before the Prayer begins. It has also provided as an alternative a General Supplication (including petition for rulers) which is said paragraph by paragraph in Litany form by the Deacon, with the congregation responding with "Hear us, we beseech thee" and the celebrant concluding with a collect—an interesting borrowing from Eastern usage.

A point that needs consideration arises here. It is quite true, as the American revisers say, that "a supplication for Rulers . . . came as an integral part of the supplication for the Peace of the Church",[1] but it came in the General Intercession for all sorts and conditions of men that followed the Synaxis. Within the central action of the Eucharist the Church has traditionally prayed only for its own members; hence the opening part of our Prayer for the Church, based as it is on the *Te igitur* section of the Roman Canon, limits its petition to *Christian* Kings, Princes and Governors. The various branches of the Anglican Communion will have to make up

[1] *Prayer Book Studies*, vol. iv, p. 210.

their minds which kind of General Intercession they feel most appropriate to modern conditions. If the Prayer is to remain a Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church, then its wording must be governed by that intention. If it is to be a General Intercession for those inside and outside the Church alike, then it will need recasting and, if tradition is to be any guide, removing to a place before the Offertory.

The Indian prayer has one paragraph which avoids the exclusive concentration of the corresponding paragraph in 1928 on missionary and educational forms of Christian service: "And bless, we beseech thee, in their several callings all other thy servants, who are labouring for the building up of thy Church and the spread of thy Gospel, and grant that the whole world may be filled with the knowledge of thy truth." There is also a paragraph, very necessary in India, concerned with scarcity and famine, and the Commemoration of Saints is an abbreviated version of that in the Scottish Liturgy.

Proper Prefaces are provided for all Church seasons and a number of special occasions—there are twenty in all. The Sanctus leads directly into the Consecration Prayer with its Syrian opening clause: "Holy in truth art thou, and blessed in truth, O Almighty God . . ." The prayer follows the South African rite in including a reference to the Incarnation as well as Calvary: ". . . for that thou of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to take our nature upon him and renew thine image within us, and to suffer death . . ."

It also follows the South African rite in retaining the 1662 "Invocation" ("Hear us, O merciful Father"), which is redundant in view of the later Epiclesis, and also (equally unhappily) keeps the Fraction at the Words of Institution. The Anamnesis, Epiclesis, Prayer of Oblation and Lord's Prayer follow, as in most Anglican revisions, with the Prayer of Oblation, however, making specific reference to the heavenly altar. The Pax, Benedictus and Agnus Dei may then be said or sung, and the Prayer of Humble Access immediately precedes Communion. The Gloria in Excelsis is retained in the 1662 position and provision is made for the insertion of a Post-Communion Collect before the Blessing. Twenty-five are provided for various occasions.

This proposed Prayer Book is particularly rich in Propers, and those accustomed to the limited number provided in 1928 will look with envy at their brethren in CIPBC, who now have such ample provision. There is much indeed in this book which future English revisers will have to consider carefully, and the Indian Church is to be warmly commended on a Prayer Book which many will regard as one of the most impressive in the Anglican Communion.

The second branch of the Anglican Communion whose revision of its Eucharistic Liturgy will be considered here is the Church of England in Canada. According to Fr R. F. Palmer of the Canadian Congregation of S.S.J.E.,[1] "there is no widespread desire for any

[1] *Canadian Churchman*, January 1953.

great changes in the present Service" in Canada, and it is not surprising, therefore, that its proposed revision is the most conservative of the four. The significant thing is that it has undertaken the task at all and produced a revised Communion Service, though at present only for study purposes.

This revision begins by transferring three of the rubrics at the end of 1662 to the beginning of the service and revises the reference to monetary dues: ". . . and every Parishioner shall contribute regularly of his substance to the maintenance of the worship of God, and the spread of the Gospel, according as God shall prosper him."

The Service, which keeps generally to the 1662 order, begins with the celebrant saying: "Grace be unto you and Peace from God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ."

The Ten Commandments are printed in the shorter form and the "new commandment" that "ye love one another" is added as an eleventh. They must be read one Sunday in each month and on Festivals. The Lord's Summary is provided as an alternative and the threefold Kyrie (in English) may be sung or said in addition to either. The revising Committee has apparently failed to notice that the traditional Kyries already appear as a response to the Commandments or Summary and that, if they are to be printed again, they should be used *instead* of the Commandments or Summary, not as well as one of them.

The first prayer for the Sovereign is kept, but not the second, and the responses before and after the Gospel are restored. The second and third of the Indian alterations in the translation of the Nicene Creed are included, but not the first.

There are fourteen Offertory Sentences, the first being Ps. 50. 14, but no attempt is made to make provision for the seasons. Parts of 1 Chron. 14. 10, 11, and 14, may be used at the placing of the bread and wine and the alms on the altar.

The Prayer for the Church, called the Intercession, includes petitions for "all those who proclaim the Gospel of thy Kingdom among the nations" and for "all who serve mankind in labour, learning and industry", but keeps to 1662 in its reference to the faithful departed. It does, however, allow a remembrance before God of "our brethren who have departed this life and are at rest" in a bidding before the Prayer.

The Sursum Corda is introduced with "℣. The Peace of the Lord be with you. ℟. And with thy spirit", and four new Proper Prefaces are supplied. The Sanctus leads straight into the Consecration Prayer, which has a proper Eucharistic beginning and which, like the Indian rite, includes a reference to the Incarnation: "Blessing and glory and thanksgiving be unto thee Almighty God, our heavenly Father, who of thy tender mercy didst give thine only Son Jesus Christ to take our nature upon him and to suffer death. . . ."

The clause "Hear us, O merciful Father . . ." has a justifiable place in the proposed Canadian Canon, because there is no Epiclesis later in the prayer; one could wish that it had been transferred to the usual position of the Epiclesis, even if not given the specific form

of an Invocation of the Holy Spirit. The Fraction is also (unhappily) kept in the 1662 place. There is an Anamnesis after the words of Institution which is unique. It is clearly an attempt to provide a form which can be used happily by Evangelicals and High Churchmen alike:

"Wherefore, O Lord and heavenly Father, in union with all thy holy Church, we do this in remembrance of him who died, and rose again, and ever liveth to make intercession for us, presenting unto thy divine Majesty this our thankoffering and service, through the merits and mediation of thy beloved Son. . . ."

This Anamnesis is immediately followed by the Prayer of Humble Access and the Communion; and the rest of the service is as in 1662, though a rubric allows both the Prayer of Oblation and the Prayer of Thanksgiving to be used, as in the present Canadian book. The one verbal change is the elimination of the otiose "Thou that takest away the sins of the world, have mercy upon us", from the Gloria, as in the American rite. The Long Exhortations are printed after the service.

It is likely that any future revision of the Eucharistic rite in England will look rather to the American, South African, and Indian, than to this Canadian rite; but it is good to see yet another branch of the Anglican Communion seeking to supply some of the deficiencies of the 1662 Canon.

(*To be concluded*)

C. Kenneth Sansbury.

Clothes in Church

Let it be said at once that this is not a disquisition upon the garments worn by the Vicar either in church or out. That this elegant Miss Jennifer, overtaking him in her fiancé's sports car, as he goes to say Evensong, might be hard put to it to give a name to his cassock need occasion no pained surprise. As little can our younger laywomen be expected to master the terminology of ecclesiastical vesture as our clergy to equip themselves for expert discussion of the latest dictates of the couturiers. Naturally Jennifer would wish her parish priest to be correctly clad at her approaching nuptials, but it is not to reassure herself on the point that she now stays her progress to the tennis courts and accosts the Vicar.

"Hullo, Jennifer!" cries he. "Everything ready for the great day?" Himself a family man, he is not unaware of the importance of bottom drawers nor, being a sound theologian untainted by oriental soulfulness, does he condemn the materialism that interests itself in trousseaux. And that will be the burden of this essay—that the art of the

dressmaker (and, for that matter, of the confectioner) is not to be despised, since the Christian Faith neither destines us to become eternal wraiths nor conceives that we should be better during this sublunary life could we subsist upon good music and high thinking. Chiefly it will be argued that the parish priest is wise who, by whatever simple devices his ingenuity can discover, turns the wardrobe, as well as the teapot, to the ends of pastoral strategy. Thereby he will seek to redirect the disordered appetites, which in common with mankind his parishioners share with him to the Creator from whom they, including their appetites, derive and to whom they belong.

Our Vicar, who eschews the pomposity of an age that calls its bad boys and girls juvenile delinquents, is not in the habit of speaking of visual aids. He realizes, however, that what is seen is apt to prove more intelligible to the majority of his flock than what is merely said. Best of all are practices which they themselves can observe in connexion with events, such as weddings, which stir their emotions, and objects, such as clothes, which engage their interest. So it is that he rejoices when the maidens and matrons of the congregation appear at church on Easter Day in their new spring ensembles, and he has been known not only to preach a thoroughly biblical sermon on the custom, but to advert to it in his letter to the parish magazine. The latter organ should in his opinion be devoted to recording and commenting upon the unpretentious incidents of parish life which, rather than the researches of the sociologist and the liturgist, normally exercise the thoughts of its readers. It is the festival, the death, the bun-fight, that he must try, without becoming sententious, to handle prophetically or to use as a means of sometimes oblique instruction, and he has sought to show that the bedecking of the person is an entirely suitable way for those who believe in the new creation and the resurrection of the body to celebrate the Pascal victory that has given substance to those hopes.

So too, remembering that "trees bearing their fruit", and not ideals bearing their clichés, were seen by the Creator to be good in the Book of Genesis, he welcomes the juicy pears and rosy apples that decorate the church at the Harvest Festival. A choir-boy sucking an orange, he has asserted, is no less pleasing to God than a choir-boy singing, "O for the wings of a dove", and he himself is robustly looking forward to the good things which he confidently expects that Jennifer's parents will provide for their guests. The Lord, whom contemporary austerity could dub "wine-bibber", he believes to have attended parties, such as Matthew gave, because he enjoyed them. That the disaster threatening two young people's marriage feast should have been the occasion of Messiah's first sign and showing of his glory surprises him not at all.

O si sic omnes! The biblical doctrine of creation has indeed been restored to something of its proper prominence of late and is in a fair way to oust original sin as the immediate furore of the theologians. Again, the introduction into our churches of ceremonies associated with the instruments and products of daily toil has, we may hope, been doing something to dispel in less theologically-minded

circles the notion that the sacred must be so rarefied as to stand aloof from the secular. Yet still too often these reasoned theses and organized exercises remain on the periphery of church life, while the very opportunities, placed unsought-for in our path, of routing a perennial heresy are handled in such a way as actually to imply it. Why, for instance, must the Town Hall be hired for the Diocesan Conference, when we already possess a large church in the heart of that very borough? Is it not because the Quota is thought too gross a subject to debate in a place of worship? Yet to give such discussions a synodical setting might both cure us of the fatal error of separating worship and finance into scarcely-related departments, and bring the whole business, including those parts of it which a well-instructed Buddhist might properly disdain, under the governance of God's word.

But we wander from clothes, and examples are not lacking in that field. A letter sent to the present writer by one of his younger acquaintances from her boarding school springs to mind. She is being prepared for confirmation and doubtless the formal instruction which she is receiving is excellent. But formal instruction is not everything. Incidentals may probably prove more memorable, and our friend's head mistress was, we think, unduly shocked that the animated discussion in which she found her young charges engaged before one of the classes concerned not the Church Catechism but the dresses being prepared for them to wear at the confirmation. It was, it seems, the design of one of these, rather than the Creed, that she had overheard being described as "wizard", and indeed as "smashing". Now, naturally no head mistress can allow the candidates to see confirmation wholly in terms of a parental visit, a good lunch at an hotel, and a charming, if demure, frock. Such extravagances as braided hair will be both unapostolic and unsuitable to such an occasion, and Geraldine, whose mother will come to the confirmation in her smart new Lagonda, must not be permitted to put out of countenance Prudence, whose parents are debating how to raise a third-class railway fare. Yet to tell any damsel that she should at this or at any other time think nothing of clothes was, to say the least of it, a waste of breath. To add that neither God nor the Bishop would be interested in the outward appearance of the candidates was not only to wrong a genial prelate but to utter an extremely doubtful theological proposition.

The Lord, who bade us not to be anxious about raiment, pointed in doing so to the beauty of the lilies. Admittedly his words must not be lifted from their setting and used as a text for flights of poetic fancy in a Flower Service sermon. Yet it may reasonably be inferred that the Creator of the daffodil will not look less favourably on his higher creatures because they present themselves before him modestly adorned. Incidentally the Sunday best may be something of an act of witness in a world in which to do anything at all about Sunday, as an observance, becomes old-fashioned. On that count those Christians who pay regard to their personal appearance, when they assemble and meet together, are to be commended. But indeed

there is scarcely a part of sound doctrine that a concern to look as pleasing as one may, in itself a worthy undertaking, cannot be made to disseminate and express. Thus at the wedding instruction, when the bridegroom has been urged to put into saying, "With my body I thee worship", all the zeal of his courtship, both bride and bridegroom will be reminded that the powdered nose and pomaded hair, small sacramentals by which they have been seeking to commend themselves to one another, must not cease through their perilously taking one another for granted in marriage.

But to return to confirmation frocks—of course, the Serpent lurks in their folds, and those who will wear them are subject to his wiles. Geraldine would hardly be a daughter of Eve, were she not sometimes inclined to vaunt herself upon the possession of a fine horse and of an elder sister, who has been presented at Court. The ruthless self-assertion that so often characterizes the infant-school playground, when the teachers' backs are turned, remains with us, under whatever disguises, in later life, and Prudence's demeanour towards her younger brothers and sisters has on occasion been such as might discourage the junior school from looking forward to her becoming a prefect. Certainly neither of these young ladies is above spending more time before the mirror than the promotion of tidiness requires. We are born idolaters, whether it be ourselves, some other creature, or even, it may be, a Church that we worship, and we live in a world tragically ravaged by our idolatry, and in which the excellent and delightful often hovers on the edge of the murk. Let it not be thought then that what is recommended here is a superficial health and beauty cult. The frock, the hockey colours, the very mitre are charged with Satan's spells.

But that is exactly our complaint against the attitude of mind which would treat frocks as of no account, for it is to hand over God's creatures of silk and satin to Satan, and with them, it may be, the more precious creatures the silk and satin are going to contain. They of a surety will not hold confirmation or any other frocks in no account. Thus at the very moment when the head mistress is doing her stuff with the parents and fondly imagining that her girls are emulating Plotinus, the dormitory mirrors will be turned into shrines. The Bishop will lay hands on rows of goddesses.

Does Jennifer, whom we left talking to the Vicar, remember perhaps, as she drives away, a slip of paper which he gave to her at the time of her confirmation, and will she make use of it again when she has dressed for her wedding? Certainly he has not reminded her of it, for while he seizes opportunities he is not an improver of inappropriate occasions. On it was written one sentence, "O God, I thank you for making me and my confirmation frock, and I offer myself to you in it", and above it the Vicar had put, "To be said when you have dressed". Reorientation is a long word to use of anything so simple, yet it might have that effect. Our Vicar is a great believer in simple things. The suggestion which he makes on his visit to the home before a Baptism that each year there should be a special cake at tea on the anniversary of the Baptism is far more

likely, he thinks, to impress the Christian birthday on the child's mind than any amount of exhortation.

For these are not only little things. They are personal, they are natural, they are on the plane on which most of us live, which is a plane on which esoteric symbolism plays a very slight part. We offer the Girl Guide Colour, and rightly, but why not the nylons? They are Enid's first pair, and anybody who argues that the true and excellent things that Captain said about the Colour ought to stir her emotions to the same degree as the nylons is failing to understand what manner of creature God has made in Enid. We are not meaning that nylons should be carried in the Offertory procession. We are not recommending any kind of stunt. Something, however, should be done to dispel the idea that the garments, which tradition has associated with clergymen, servers, and choirs, have acquired an exclusive sanctity. That is not in the least to say that they should be iconoclastically done away. They can indeed become a snare, and it is far healthier for servers to be interested in neckties than in cottas, but there is a value in the conservatism that still dresses him who presides over the Eucharist in the clothes of a Roman gentleman.

Yet in point of fact, and it is a fact which the historically minded find it hard to take to heart, the primitive and the antique make little appeal to those for whom they carry no associations. "It's very nice", was the comment of a Mothers' Union, after visiting one of the most ancestral of our country houses, "but it's rather old." Surely a revealing remark for those who would be at pains to understand their neighbours! Thus it is a selfish aestheticism on the part of the cultured that is content to sacrifice the intelligibility and vitality of God's word to the stateliness of an outmoded diction. Not that everything must be put into words of two syllables. The genius of Miss Beatrix Potter perceived that children appreciate fine words, and the good mother, reading aloud of the "soporific effect" which the lettuces had on the Flopsy Bunnies, rolls the expression round her tongue that her audience may savour it. But "hath" and "saith" merely render the Bible remote and monumental to the majority of our generation, and a garment soaked in numinosity for the few may seem nothing but a curiosity to the many. What is to be utterly eschewed on every ground is olde-worldiness. There is much to be said for adding to the sometimes tenuous and uncertain treble of the choir-boys the support of female voices, but who are these Portias? The Tudoresque is as absurd in the chancel as in the suburb.

But there is more to it than that. These horrid robes are oftentimes concealing charming dresses, and the choir-lady surely presents us with the very opportunity that we should be seeking of patently sanctifying that form of artistic expression which is by far the most highly and most universally regarded amongst us. So too it should on occasion be made clear that those who do attendance in the sanctuary can do it with perfect propriety in well-creased trousers—we would not ourselves be so romantic as to dress them in boiler suits. Much is here at stake. If we would communicate (though it may be

seriously doubted whether it is communication so much as the attainment of a clear apprehension of what is to be communicated that baffles us), these are the things through which we must communicate. If we would make the doctrines of creation and salvation relevant, these are the things to which their relevance must be shown. The somewhat theoretical emphasis which Marx has taught even those who love his memory least to put on economics can result in a highbrow misunderstanding of one's fellows. Certainly young Jack, who works at the Power Station, must be taught that the Power Station, and not only the Cathedral, is a temple of the living God, but young Jack, if the truth be told, is more interested in his new football shirt than in the Power Station.

Have football shirts, have nylons, have even horses, no counterpart in the new creation? Then Jack, Enid, Geraldine are going to find little to excite them in the prospect of the consummation of all things, or to interest them in the worship in which we foretaste it. But those who sing, "the shout of them that feast", grand words so shocking to our neo-Athenians, ought not to be disappointing these young people and, in doing so, encouraging them to turn into idols what their highfalutin' mentors have themselves taught them to separate from God. The answer to this idolatry is not to disparage the idols, which are God's good creatures, but to offer them up to him, and the important thing is that they shall be the real idols, which remain much the same in a technical society as when Adam and Eve first fancied themselves in their coats of skins. Is Jack in danger of becoming an Adonis? Let Adonis lay his trophies at more splendid feet. Is Geraldine's recent success in the jumping at the show liable to issue in idolatry? Let her offer up herself and her horse and the exultation of being lifted over a jump to the God in whom she lives and moves and has her being, and in whose exultation in his creation she has been sharing. Let them be added to our Benedicite. Even our head mistress, who is, like most head mistresses, as unlike the head mistresses of fiction as can be imagined, has, we believe, not only the reproduction of a Picasso in her study to offer, but a new coat and skirt which she is looking forward to wearing on Speech Day.

F. Bennett.

The Evidence of Things not Seen

I have never forgotten Ernest Pontifex' encounter with the rationalist tinker in Samuel Butler's *The Way of All Flesh*. After I had prepared and preached my Easter sermons, I took down Butler's novel and read the passage again. Mr Shaw, the tinker, forced Ernest to recognize that he had taken the story of the Resurrection for granted, without ever asking himself whether he did actually believe it or not. When he did ask himself that question, the answer which he got was "No, no, no". It is a disturbing passage for a parson, who is compelled by the pressure of his duties and the nature of his situa-

tion to make many assumptions. He cannot be examining the grounds of his faith all over again every week. He is apt to assume therefore that all that was settled for him a long time ago, and to avoid any books which might have the effect of unsettling it. It is easy to get into a frame of mind not far removed from that of Ernest Pontifex.

The irritant of Samuel Butler led to a rapid re-reading of such Christian treatments of the Resurrection evidence as were immediately to hand; in particular the present Bishop of Durham's small but immensely valuable book in the Christian Challenge series, and the pages on the Resurrection in Dr Lowther Clarke's Concise Bible Commentary.

To a plain parson the following three facts seem to emerge:

(1) The New Testament contains, and itself by its very existence is, impressive evidence for the faith of the Apostles and those closely associated with them. Certainly the fact of the Resurrection was believed in the very early Church. And it was believed in a way which made a difference to every other belief. Written evidence cannot take you directly to the actual fact. It cannot take you beyond the faith of those from whom that evidence ultimately comes. The New Testament does take you convincingly to that point, and that is all that you can reasonably expect of it.

(2) It is when we try to reach beyond the faith of the Apostles, and take hold of the event by which that faith was created, that we run into difficulty. Some of the accounts of the Resurrection appearances bear clear marks of embellishment due to controversial and theological interests. This is obviously true of St Matthew's account. The stories in the Fourth Gospel are so full of theological and symbolic significance as to make the boundary between interpretation and fact uncertain. We have to face the possibility that the meaning may have created, or at any rate manipulated, some of the stories. (But the existence of that "meaning" itself seems to require a prior fact.)

(3) Reconstructions of "what actually happened" by radical critics and sceptics are quite unconvincing. They are nothing but exercises of the imagination. There are only the New Testament records to go on. As soon as you try to go behind them you are left only with speculation based on your own presuppositions. Moreover, such "reconstructions" seem quite inadequate to carry the weight of the New Testament and the Christian experience.

What do these three facts, if they are accepted, add up to? To me they suggest that evidence and argument cannot give us the kind of secured rational certainty about the Resurrection that we hanker after, and that sceptics like Butler demand. There remains a gap between the faith of the New Testament and our knowledge of the events which are held to have created that faith. I do not believe that this ought to surprise us. I believe that it is involved in the meaning of the Resurrection.

The difficulty is largely one for the imagination. We want to be able to picture *how* it could have happened. We want to be able to

fit it satisfactorily within our general world picture. It is a desire which will never be satisfied. Conservative scholars try to weave the various accounts into a unity which shall be coherent and acceptable, given the presupposition of miracle—i.e., they make an intellectual assumption of "miracle", and then proceed to treat the stories as if they were ordinary stories of an ordinary event. Radical scholars attempt so to reconstruct the event as to reduce the miraculous element to a minimum, or to get rid of it altogether. In both cases an attempt is being made to treat the Resurrection as an event which belongs entirely within our world of space, time, and causality. There is an assumption that our normal categories of knowledge and perception are adequate to handle this event. We want to domesticate it, so that we can sit beside it quiet and undisturbed; in the one case in piety, in the other in unbelief. We want to make it a smoothly continuous part of history, so that we can imagine it as we can imagine the landing of William the Conqueror. We want coherence.

But *if* such an event as the Resurrection took place, of course there would be a gap between the two sides: between the pattern of events which we can follow in this world, and the breaking in of the power of the transcendent God. We should expect incoherence and fragmentary confusion. We should expect a mix-up between interpretation and fact; something which we cannot satisfactorily get our hands on. It would not be the kind of event which we could apprehend sitting comfortably where we are. We should have to shift our ground; to make a jump. There is not a straight, continuous line from Time to Eternity; from Man to God; from this world to the life of the world to come. There is a discontinuity which cannot be overcome by man, but only by God. That, surely, is part of the meaning of the Resurrection. At some point or other it demands an act of faith in the living God. We do not reach eternity, we do not achieve salvation, by the exercise of our own wisdom, our own perception, or our own piety. We can only receive it, by laying hold of the Gospel of God. The Resurrection is the point where our faith is swung across the chasm, from ourselves to God.

"Whom, not having seen, ye love." The use of the word "seen" in this text may perhaps be applied to that assured rational certainty which we have not been vouchsafed.

F. E. Stalley.

Luther Reconsidered

Luther's reputation in England has in part been governed by the accidental circumstance that Biblical criticism hit the Germans before it hit the English. It was true that the Caroline divines had regarded him as one whose doctrine upon the Eucharist should not be followed, and they thought it unfortunate that the course of the German Reformation had prevented the maintenance of the episcopal ministry. But they ever looked on him with affection and respect as the initiator of the Reformation. It was true also that the

eighteenth century first began the process of lowering his reputation, and that the attitude of some schools of thought prepared for the catastrophe which overtook the name of Luther in the nineteenth century. Luther was dogmatic and militant. The latitudinarianism of the eighteenth century disliked both dogma and militancy, and in writers like Bishop Watson of Llandaff Luther had fallen before Locke. The writers of the new liberal movement—a whig historian of literature like Hallam, a democrat like Cobbett—offered the first non-Roman Catholic judgments on Luther which were to be characterized by abuse as well as ignorance. There can be no doubt also that the general dislike of the Evangelical movement in the eighteen-twenties and thirties created suspicion of Calvin in particular and of all the Reformers by consequence.

But what shocked the English was the discovery that Germany was steadily abandoning the inerrant and verbal truth of the Bible. Pusey and H. J. Rose and others sought to explain this phenomenon, which looked like a national apostasy. In the prevalent atmosphere it was easy to suppose that the seeds of rationalism must have been present in the very outset of modern German theology. It was awkward to imagine Luther in the character of a rationalist. But the solution was found in the theory that Luther had proclaimed the right of private judgment, and that the right of private judgment led by inevitable gradations to the rationalism of the day. This was how the British chaplain at Hamburg in 1844 explained the condition of German theology. Strauss and Bauer and even Feuerbach were given an ancestry running back in the end to Luther. The English observers might be in part forgiven for their judgment. For it was what the German scholars themselves were claiming. To obtain a hearing for new thought in Germany, it was necessary to show that the thought was a consistent interpretation of Luther, and therefore a theologian like Schleiermacher or a critic like Bretschneider did indeed claim that his thought was the logical and legitimate and correct interpretation of Luther's principles in application to modern needs. The English believed them. The normal ignorance of the German language in the English universities did nothing to correct the impression.

To a Church ready to believe evil of Luther came the Tractarian appeal to antiquity and the Tractarian distrust of theological formulations which did not breathe the atmosphere of antiquity. Newman's *Lectures on Justification* gave a travesty of Luther's thought, a travesty which few beside Julius Hare were competent to observe. W. G. Ward in a succession of articles in the *British Critic* used the maximum violence of language based on the minimum of information—the "undisguised deformity" of the doctrine of justification by faith—"no heresy has ever prevailed so subtle and extensively poisonous". After 1843, when the translation of the *Symbolik* was published, the standard source of information about Luther's theology was Moehler, whom no one would now recognize to be an impartial student of Luther's thought. Throughout the nineteenth century a large body of English churchmen, which did not know

Luther but knew that it disliked contemporary German theology or such reports of it as they could apprehend, accepted these vague but uncomplimentary theories. Early in the twentieth century the attack was renewed from a more formidable quarter. The rising Roman Catholic school of critical history produced two eminent historians who turned their full batteries upon Luther. Denifle had proved himself an expert contributor to medieval research. In 1904 he launched an onslaught upon Luther's morality, his pride, his grossness, his unchastity. There was much in Denifle of permanent value to the study of Luther, particularly the relation of Luther to the traditions of medieval theology: but he left the total impression that the onslaught on Luther's morality was central. His successor Hartmann Grisar abandoned, in face of the evidence, the charges of immorality, allowed that Denifle had misunderstood Luther's use of *concupiscentia*, but was nearly as unfavourable in general tone to Luther as a person and as a theologian.

The Protestant rage aroused by Denifle and Grisar resulted as its best by-product in a serious and determined effort of German scholarship to understand Luther critically as well as sympathetically. The fruits of this long inquiry, which in recent years have been reinforced by learned Scandinavian contributions, have been filtering through to English readers. Diverse reasons have caused us to listen more willingly than our grandfathers to a defence of Luther. The ecumenical movement has led us to seek to understand: and a modern Roman Catholic writer like Lortz differs altogether from Denifle and Grisar in his attitude to Luther. The abandonment of the doctrine of verbal inerrancy in Scripture has slowly rendered us less immediately suspicious of any theology that came from Germany. The reaction against liberalism since 1918 has caused us to pick up once again the writings of the great Reformers, who were always concerned with God's quest for man rather than man's quest for God. And in the work of transmitting the fruits of modern Lutheran scholarship the contribution of Methodist scholars has been momentous—Dr Newton Flew, Mr Philip Watson, Mr R. E. Davies, and now, perhaps in pride of place, Mr Rupp.

Mr Rupp's new book[1] takes an unusual form. Those of us who were privileged to hear the Birkbeck lectures of 1947, on which it is based, remember with keen pleasure the rapier with which the lecturer thrust here, there and everywhere. In part of this book—for it has as its sub-title *Luther studies* and is more a collection of essays than a rounded whole—this quality scintillates. There is a gripping study of the historiography of Luther: an original essay, based on material mainly in the Public Record Office, of the romantic career of Captain Henry Bell, the first translator of the *Table Talk*: a study of the relations between Luther and Erasmus; of Luther's attitude to secular government; of Père Congar's view of Luther in *Vraie et Fausse Réforme*. But in the central section of the book, headed *Coram Deo*, the author has suddenly, unexpectedly, with-

[1] *The Righteousness of God*, by Gordon Rupp (Hodder and Stoughton, 25s.).

drawn himself. It is a study of Luther's theological development until the *Rationis Latomianae Confutatio* of 1521. Part of it is almost an anthology rather than an essay. Mr Rupp plainly believes that English readers, whose Luther-horizon has so often been circumscribed by the narrow compasses of the Primary Works translated by Wace and Buchheim, must be led to study Luther's own words and discern the theological and expository and devotional quality in the man. The translations of the passages he selects are always excellent. It is much easier to browse gently in a series of translations than it is to read them at a sitting, and that is what the reader will find when he tackles the section *Coram Deo*. Mr Rupp, I believe, would not be disappointed. He considers Luther's thought to be as profound as that of the most philosophical theologian or the most numinous poet, and he does not expect the reader to be able to probe this profundity with superficial reading. He has sought to give us Luther rather than his own commentary on Luther. He restrains his commentary to brief notices of the contributions to particular points by recent Scandinavian and German research, a bumpy field over which he moves with sure and familiar tread.

Many fruitful theological developments have sprung from the need to counter uninformed pamphleteering. The signal advances in the study of Luther have been in part due to the necessity for countering prejudice: and it still cannot be assumed that prejudice is not with us. But this background to Luther-research brings a corresponding disadvantage. Mr Rupp does not quite rid himself of the feeling that Luther is on the defensive: there are moments when you can almost trace the assumption that Luther needs defending and the best form of defence is attack—almost, for Mr Rupp is not only a brilliant scholar, but has far too sound a judgment to fall into this trap.

Luther has been charged with three main iniquities—his character, his appeal to the godly prince, and his theology of justification. There are few who now believe the old stories about his person: he was no saint, but he was a prophet with a deep moral fervour. There are few educated men who now believe the old and crude theories about his Erastianism—if any of those theories are dying rather than dead, Mr Rupp's thirteenth chapter will help them to euthanasia. The question of his theology remains. He possessed insight into Biblical truth and genius at expounding it. But if theology also needs accurate formulation, how far is it necessary to formulate the truths around justification in Luther's not always consistent language? The question is not only what, if we take the whole Luther, he intended to say about justification. The question is also whether some of his emphatic statements adequately represent his real intention. For anyone who wants to study to what extent Luther began with the doctrine of imputation which became characteristic of Lutheran orthodoxy, Mr Rupp's study of his mind from the Commentary on Romans onwards is quite indispensable.

Owen Chadwick.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

The Rev. C. K. Sansbury is Warden of St Augustine's College, Canterbury.

The Rev. Frank Bennett is Rector of Wigan and an Hon. Canon of Liverpool Cathedral.

The Rev. F. E. Stalley is Vicar of St Margaret's, Coventry.

The Rev. W. O. Chadwick is Fellow and Dean of Trinity Hall, Cambridge.

CORRESPONDENCE

THEOLOGICAL ISSUES OF CONTRACEPTION

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Canon Warner's statement that "an unconsummated marriage has been the only kind which the Church has ever been inclined to admit of 'dissolution'" made strange reading, particularly as the sentence is part of a paper delivered at an Ecumenical Conference. On what grounds is the practice of the whole Orthodox Church (the second largest group of Christians in the world) so ignored? There are many grounds for a Church divorce in the Orthodox East, and according to as high authority as Prof. Alivasatos, *always* have been. Remarriage after divorce is always possible for the innocent party and in certain cases in some, if not all, Orthodox Churches for the guilty party. In any case does Canon Warner's "ever" apply even to the Western Church? What of the *Poenitentiale* of Theodore, for example?

Yours etc.,

O. FIELDING CLARKE.

37 CLAPHAM COMMON WEST SIDE,
LONDON, S.W.4.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In his letter of criticism in your March number, Mr Tinsley has misunderstood the precise points I tried to make. I was concerned to suggest that the exclusve use of the "safe period" involved artificial *constraint* upon a relational act the essence of which is spontaneity—the meeting of "I" and "Thou" in coitus. Where "constraint" comes from within—the will—there is no necessary disruption of this personal relation, for such volitional constraint (e.g. during the later months of pregnancy) is part of the whole movement of unselfishness—i.e. it is personal. To be watching the calendar is to put overemphasis upon the physical aspects of coitus, the very thing I imagine we all alike deplore.

Scientific contraceptives are external in a wholly different sense, for they are external to the *body*, and not to the "experience". Where contraceptives are properly used they need not affect the per-

sonal experience, nor need they destroy spontaneity, particularly when they are regularly used.

I used the example of the wearing of glasses; I might equally well have used another, the use of a microscope to extend the function of the normal eye *in the interests of society* (cp. the bacteriologist). True that contraceptives do not directly make good a deficiency, but they do make possible the relational achievement of coitus *in the interests of the family* (the health of the family in no small way depends on the stability of the marriage relationship). I would add, too, that in so far as relational coitus is concerned, suitable contraceptives do *not* alter the character of the act, i.e. the achievement of orgasm.

I grant Mr Tinsley his right to object on aesthetic grounds to contraceptives. Should he or others feel such aesthetic objections that would indicate that *for such people* contraceptives may not be the answer. I have found, however, that those whose objection is aesthetic often have in mind types of contraceptives which are now out of date and seldom recommended. There are many who feel none of this aesthetic repulsion, and for whom the symbolically suggestive nature of coitus remains wholly unaffected by the use of modern contraceptives.

Mr Clarke, in the above letter which you have allowed me to see, rightly takes me up on my omission to mention the Orthodox Church. In using the word "Church" I was actually referring to the Western Church, in which the Canonists, while "stoutly maintaining that an unconsummated marriage is a marriage, and, as such, indissoluble, admitted that its indissolubility was not so absolute as that of a consummated marriage" (Lacey, *Marriage in Church and State*, p. 119). I had in mind the fact that in the Roman Church to-day an unconsummated marriage can be dissolved in two ways—by the profession of religious vows, and by special Papal dispensation.

Mr Clarke no doubt knows that Lacey, evidently taking the 87th Canon of Quinisext (A.D. 692) as constitutive of the Eastern Orthodox view, held that when permission is given to remarry after divorce (the former partner living) there is no claim to have "dissolved" the bond of the original marriage; there is simply a dispensation to engage in "successive polygamy". Dr Mortimer, however, like Mr Clarke, dissents from this view (see his Preface to Second Edition of *Marriage in Church and State*).

Yours sincerely,
HUGH C. WARNER.

CHURCH HOUSE,
DEAN'S YARD,
LONDON, S.W.1.

THEOLOGY IN SCHOOLS AND UNIVERSITIES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

The Rev. A. H. Dammers raised an important question in his letter in your February issue. If there is to be a revival of the

reading of theology in the universities, must there not first come a revival of theology, or at least of the necessary preparatory studies, in our public and grammar schools?

In his letter he referred to my article in your issue for November 1953, and wrote: "The Archdeacon referred to his own experience at Marburg University, where 'the students of theology were numbered in hundreds and not in tens'. We must ask how many of those men had already acquired at school some knowledge of Latin, Greek, and even Hebrew . . . essential tools for the theological trade."

If I may be allowed slightly to change Mr Dammers' question, and ask "How many of these men had acquired a working knowledge of Hebrew, Greek, and Latin, before entering the University to read theology?" the answer, the only possible answer, is, I believe, "Every one." An exception is, I believe, as impossible as in the Church of England for an ordinand to be made deacon before his 23rd birthday: and for the same reason. What was in origin a canonical requirement has been fixed by statute law. From this requirement no bishop or church official may dispense, and no university modify its matriculation requirements. This State enforcement of an ancient canonical demand survived even the history of the last thirty-five years, including the period of National Socialism. The same demand was made without exception of the ex-service candidates of the last war.

My authority in making these statements is a paper by Dr E. M. H. Fischer, Assistant to Professor Rengstorf of the University of Münster, who was at the Queen's College, Birmingham, in 1948. This paper, written in 1952, was entitled *Die Pfarrerausbildung in der Evangelischen Kirche in Deutschland.* I trust I have interpreted Dr Fischer correctly. If I have been inaccurate, there are in this country priests, like the Rev. Ernest Gordon, who had their training in Germany and who will correct me.

No student can be admitted to read theology in a German University until he has secured his *Abitur,* which shows that he has a sufficient knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, the two Biblical languages, and of Latin, the language of theological discussion in the West. Knowing this the student who wishes to read theology will go for his schooling to a *Gymnasium,* a school for the Humanities. But if for some reason his parents have not sent him to a *Gymnasium,* he can look for no relaxation of the *Abitur.* He is in the position of the boy who wants to read Greats at Oxford but has not been on the classical side at school.

And of course Mr Dammers is quite right. This is why "German-speaking scholars still hold the theological initiative". They have begun their theological grounding so much earlier than we have. The pyramid of theological scholarship in Germany has a broad base.

Yours etc.,
J. O. Cobham.

The College,
Durham.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

On page 61 of this volume, Mr Dammers pleads that theology may "take her place as an autonomous discipline along with mathematics, history, and the rest, at our public and grammar schools".

Of public schools I can say nothing more than that many schools still require boys to pass in the divinity paper of the Common Entrance Examination, the syllabus of which is vast. In grammar schools, the situation has improved in recent years. The divinity specialist is fairly common, and he is frequently given an allowance fit to compare with that for other subjects. Many boys do take divinity as a subject in the G.C.E. Perhaps it is unfortunate that the papers are frequently easy, so that the subject is often regarded as a "soft alternative".

It is surely only in exceptional schools that there is much likelihood of forming a VI Th. It is unfortunate that in the majority of schools, the odd one or two who wish to take advanced level divinity are frequently a cause of embarrassment in the provision of both teachers and books. But is this the best preparation for reading for a theological degree? The universities look for a knowledge of classical languages in those who wish to be divinity students—not knowledge of theology, and surely they are right. Mr Dammers mentions the taking of the first M.B. at school. This, however, is after all a matter of essential scientific background, rather than of medicine itself, and is probably better compared with the mastering of Greek and Latin. Too many students by far have been obliged to ground their theological studies upon a scramble to acquire "sufficient N.T. Greek".

It is regrettably true that only a minority of our boys learn any language, even English, before the absurdly late age of eleven. May I suggest that those who do then start to learn a classical language would do better to be taught Greek than Latin? The difficulty of the alphabet is only momentary, and the rewards are far greater. What we suffered from Caesar! Other considerations apart, and they are many, surely this is the best preparation that schools can give to future theologians.

Yours faithfully,

BRIAN TAYLOR.

SPALDING GRAMMAR SCHOOL,
HOLLAND, LINCOLNSHIRE.

SPEAKING IN PARABLES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Mr Dammers' article in your February issue strikes a refreshing note. His plea for more parables, and more up-to-date parables, in our theology is surely one practical answer to the need that we

should be an extension of the Incarnation, should bring our Lord into daily life, or rather show that he is already there.

The examples given are a real beginning, yet one can but point out that they represent only one side of our Lord's parabolic teaching. Not yet do we touch his use of parable in argument, so superbly shown in the story of the Good Samaritan. Nor do we see signs of his use of the startlingly unexpected, as in the Labourers in the Vineyard, or of his gay abandon in the teaching of prayer by the Importunate Widow. Compared with him we can only say, "I am a worm and no man."

We might perhaps take comfort from the thought that St Paul was no better, as his clumsy efforts show in comparing the release of a wife by the death of her husband to release from the law into justification by faith in Christ, or his still stranger ideas on the grafting of olive branches. We might take comfort, or better still we might look for the reason of our failure in the reason for St Paul's. St Paul was brought up under the Law, and in the Law. All his education and early training were in a religion of duty, of the sternest moral and ceremonial attention to detail, in legalistic argument from Scripture. After his conversion he still could not break that habit of thought, though he could apply it with ardour and superb results to Christianity. Just the same, much that is best in British education, springing from Arnold of Rugby, is aimed at Christian morals and Christian conduct, a religion of duty. Some have said that the public school religion is nearer Stoicism than Christianity. And certainly in Britishers of all classes the somewhat legalist concept of "fair play" is a basic element.

But for Jesus the essence of religion was that the world is God's world. He saw God at work in all the activities of daily life, in the grinding of flour and the baking of bread, in the fields and the harvest, the rain and the sun, in merchants at their trade and even kings at their wars. His starting-point was a glad and thankful acceptance of the rightful basis of life. Consequently he did not so much have to seek for parables, rather they sprang to him. Those that he used in his teaching he did not so much have to concoct as to choose. A real parable in that sense is not so much a mental effort as a religious experience, a revelation of God in the world. Perhaps our whole civilization and way of life will need to be much more God-centred before we shall find parables in any rich profusion. Nevertheless the attempt to do so is one to be encouraged and followed.

Yours, etc.,
J. E. D'Aeth.

Infantry Boys Battalion,
Tuxford,
Nr Newark, Notts.

BOOK REVIEWS

RELIGION AND THE MODERN MIND. By W. T. Stace. Macmillan. 21s.
ETHICS. By A. C. Ewing. English Universities Press. 6s.

Religion and the Modern Mind gives quite the best discussion of the relation between the scientific and the religious world views that I have come across. Its author is a professional philosopher at Princeton University, but it is written with remarkable, even beautiful, lucidity. It is remarkable also for its intellectual honesty: Prof. Stace never smuggles in the answers he wants by using suitable abstract camouflage words. And he refers consistently and successfully to common sense and common usage as criteria in ethical discussions.

The book is divided into three sections. In the first Prof. Stace outlines the three characteristic assumptions made by medieval men in confronting the universe. The first is the assumption that the universe was created by a God who was a person, the idea of whom could never, therefore, even by "the most elaborate and learned constructions of theologians or philosophers" be refined so as "to avoid some element of anthropomorphism" (p. 10). The second assumption was that events are to be explained in terms of purposes rather than in terms of proximate causes; the third that the universe is a moral order.

In the middle section of the book the writer describes the way in which these assumptions were undermined by the scientific revolution of the sixteenth century and replaced by the secular and relativistic outlook of the modern world.

In the third part Prof. Stace gives his own idea of the reconciliation of the opposed world views.

Some of the writer's best passages are his discussion of relativity in aesthetic judgments (p. 35); his account of the influence of Copernicus (pp. 49–56); his demolition of the "argument from design" (pp. 70–79); and his approach to the problem of absolute values (pp. 277–285).

The book has three weaknesses. The first is perhaps natural in a philosopher: the tendency to attribute changes in ideas exclusively to thinking; e.g. "the scientific revolution was the ultimate cause of modern moral subjectivism" (p. 101). The movements of human thought are a response not only to advances in knowledge but to changed conditions of living: the rise of the "bourgeoisie" during the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries produced a psychological soil in which certain philosophical ideas took root and flourished.

Secondly, Prof. Stace considers that "no argument from nature . . . has the slightest tendency to prove the existence of God" or to disprove it. He refers rather scornfully to the neo-Thomists but he never deals with their argument that an analysis of certain kinds of experience—abstract thinking, for example, or telepathy—may lead to conclusions regarding the nature of the universe and the existence

of God. The third weakness is closely related: his surprisingly unperceptive treatment of the First Cause and of miracles. He is sympathetic to a religious view of life but he admits that this is a recent development in his thought. Perhaps this development is still proceeding.

It is a sad come-down to pass from Prof. Stace's book to Dr Ewing's. Not being a professional philosopher myself I can only judge the latter book, which belongs to the "Teach Yourself" series, as a layman's introduction. It seems to me to have little to commend it to a non-specialist reader. One or two sections are clear and perceptive, for example on the implications of determinism. But he has a habit of dealing with uncongenial theories in terms of their poorest versions. Let me illustrate from his treatment of hedonism.

In the first place he is inconsistent in his use of the word "pleasure". On p. 17 he explains that in philosophical language this "is intended to cover all satisfactions, not only the mundane pleasures of good dinners and amusements, but the joy of the most selfless and spiritualized love, the unselfish satisfaction of the righteous in furthering the general good, and the delight of the religious mystic in communion with God". Yet in several places later (pp. 26, 44, and 46, amongst others) he castigates the hedonist in terms that make it quite clear that he is using the word "pleasure" to mean merely sensory gratification.

In the second place he does not trouble to make a clear statement of the offending theory. Thus he sums up egoistic hedonism as "the view that ultimately we cannot be under an obligation to pursue anything but our own greatest happiness" (p. 16). Does this mean, "We experience no sense of obligation to pursue other ends"? Or does it mean, "Whether or not we experience any sense of obligation to pursue our happiness, this is the only legitimate duty"? Or does it mean, "All the highest duties we acknowledge do, by the nature of things, contribute to our own ultimate happiness, in this life or the next"? Or something else? In some passages he appears to be attacking the view expressed in the second alternative; but when he writes "It is by no means possible to show that a man always gains in happiness in proportion to what would generally be regarded as his goodness" (p. 19) he seems to be attacking the third. But the third is a reasonable view to hold, as a matter of faith; and it is quite irrelevant for Dr Ewing then to add "the only reason for thinking the action will be rewarded [in a future life] is that we already think it right" (p. 19).

These are not of course the comments of an expert; but they could be repeated for several sections of the book. They express the feeling one gets that the quickness of the expert tongue is deceiving the innocent reader's understanding; and this is not the right frame of mind to induce in one who is trying to teach himself.

Exeter. K. G. Collier.

THE TRINITY IN CONTEMPORARY THEOLOGY. By Claude Welch. S.C.M. Press. 18s.

Dr Welch is an American scholar. His purpose in this diligently compiled, often critically acute, study may be given in his own words. It is "to bring together in a single focus the widely divergent lines of thought represented in the contemporary theological scene", with a view to "the further development of Christian trinitarianism".

The book is based on a doctoral thesis and it has the formidable and, I fear, tedious erudition which such academic exercises not infrequently display. The first part of the program is carried out with laborious thoroughness. One after another the views of theologians, of varying degrees of importance and unimportance, from Schleiermacher to the present day, are summarized and criticized. The nineteenth century, says Dr Welch, reduced the Trinity to a doctrine of the second rank under the influence of Schleiermacher, Ritschl and the liberal Protestants. Their influence persisted into the twentieth century, but with the appearance of Karl Barth we can date a new era in theology. So we embark upon an elaborate review of contemporaries. Among others, Dr Brunner, Father Thornton, Miss Dorothy Sayers, various American fundamentalists, representative Roman Catholics, Dr Hodgson, are all dealt with at some length and subjected to a more or less adverse criticism. Dr Welch is particularly severe on Dr Hodgson's "social analogy". Karl Barth's views in the *Dogmatik* are given a much more cordial welcome and are expounded in great detail.

The favour shown to Barth's exposition is due largely to the support which Dr Welch finds there for the "constructive statement" which forms Part IV of his book and about one-third of its content. His argument, set forth with much insistent repetition, is, first, that the doctrine of the essential Trinity is necessary, and that modalism and subordinationism of any kind are to be rejected; and, secondly, that a true theological statement of the doctrine must proceed not synthetically, by harmonization of various elements of revelation, but analytically, showing the doctrine "as grounded simply and directly in the self-revelation of God in Jesus Christ". It is an explication, a "necessary and relevant analysis" of the confession that Jesus is the Lord, or that God has revealed himself in Christ. The doctrine is "not an answer to the question, what is the relation of the deity of Christ to monotheism or a prior conception of the Fatherhood of God?—it is an answer to the question, what is the nature of God as he reveals himself in Christ?"

Dr Welch holds that the word "person" is no longer suitable as a translation of *hypostasis* because of the misleading connotation of "person" and "personality" in modern usage. He prefers to follow Barth (and others) in speaking of "modes of being" (*Seinsweisen*), carefully guarding himself against any "modalist" idea of non-essential "manifestations".

It may be doubted whether Dr Welch has really achieved anything that may be called a "further development" of Christian trinitarian doctrine. The outcome of this very painstaking study is that the

historic orthodox doctrine of the essential Trinity is reaffirmed against modalist heresies, and that the doctrine is again shown to be implicit in the New Testament revelation. That is admirable, but hardly new. As for the great importance attached to the difference between a "synthetic" and an "analytic" approach, we may feel a certain scepticism. No doubt the difference has value against one who starts with an unbiblical rationalistic monotheism and then tries to fit in the deity of Christ and the Holy Spirit without collapsing into tritheism. The dogmatic theologian is justified in seeing the Trinity as implicit in the New Testament data. But the historian of doctrine cannot but point to a "synthesis" in the *ordo cognoscendi*, as Dr Welch himself admits at one point (p. 234). And, we may ask, how, after all, did the first Christian generation, worshippers of the God of Israel and of him alone, learn to give divine honours to the risen Lord and to the Holy Spirit, except by synthesizing their inherited Israelite religion with new insights, first, into the meaning of Christ, and then into the meaning of the Spirit? In the critical process of shaping the doctrine of the Holy Trinity both synthesis and analysis have their place.

HENRY BALMFORTH.
ELY.

THE INCARNATION: TRENDS IN MODERN ANGLICAN THOUGHT. By Lewis B. Smedes. J. H. Kok, N.V., Kampen, Holland. Fl. 5.50.

Anglicans often complain, with some justification, that Continental theology passes them by and refuses to assimilate, or even to notice, what they write. In this study we have a notable exception. It is written by an American in Holland about the central themes of English theology in the last fifty years. The perspective is as interesting and instructive as we might expect.

There is no doubt that Dr Smedes has taken us very seriously. He shows acquaintance with practically all the relevant literature and he has analysed it with real sympathy and penetration. There is certainly nothing comparable as a digest of the contribution made by such authors as Gore, Weston, Relton, Quick, Temple, Thornton and Mascall (to name only the most quoted writers); and many Anglicans themselves would be grateful to be shown the wood from the trees with such skill. Moreover, he has treated the Incarnation in all the breadth with which Anglican thought is accustomed to view it, as including not only the person of Christ incarnate and his redeeming work but its extension in the Holy Spirit, the Church and the Eucharist.

The interest for us will, however, lie mainly in the last two chapters, in which he subjects the whole ethos and trend of recent Anglican incarnational theology to searching and often devastating criticism.

Running through all our theology and underlying all its differences he traces a single assumption: "Through creaturely limitations, accentuated by sin, man was unable to fulfil his creaturely vocation. The incarnation, introducing the divine life into creation and elevating creation into the divine life, brought fulfilment to

humanity . . . Christ is the *Consummator* of creation". "The necessity of this fulfilment lay basically in an inherent incompleteness of man as finite creature. Man's need . . . was not so much moral as metaphysical, not so much in man as (sinful) personality as in man as finite nature." A higher element is thus infused into human nature, and through the Church and sacraments we receive a new metaphysical status in this divine humanity.

Against this Dr Smedes sets the Christ the Mediator of redemption, as alone corresponding to the Biblical view of man's need, not for elevation to metaphysical completion, but for reconciliation within an existing filial relationship. "For reconciliation it is of crucial and determinative significance to know *that* God and man were perfectly united in the Mediator, but it is not necessary to know *how* they were united." The "basic error" of these Anglican theologians has been to let their anthropology and "a semi-speculative view of creation's need" issue in Christologies "rationalized beyond the Scriptural limits and . . . not wholly corresponding to the Christ . . . of whom the Scriptures witness". "The modern Anglican (whether the 'liberal Catholic' like Gore or the 'contemporary Anglo-Catholic' like Thornton) has tended to adjust the idea of the union of man and God to his idea of person."

This semi-speculative metaphysical starting-point Dr Smedes believes has obscured the historical-redemptive perspective of the Bible. Participation by faith in the once and for all act of the Mediator and communion in his total person and work becomes union with the glorified manhood of the Christ perpetuated in the Church. "With the Church as the *locus*, the earthly terrain of the deified humanity of Christ, the urgent calling, the decisive believing, the dynamic *kerygma* element typical of the apostolic community is at a significant minimum." The union of the Body with its Head, entirely Scriptural as it is, must not be allowed to obscure the continuous *subjection* of the Church to the Event and the Word. "Anglicanism", to quote his final sentence, "will have to return with utter seriousness to the *whole* Biblical witness concerning the nature and purpose of the *whole* Christ."

As Dr Smedes justly observes in a footnote, "None of these writers gives evidence of having seriously read Calvin on this subject." The animadversions he has to offer from this source are fair and refreshing. An Anglican may be forgiven for wondering whether this in turn can claim to represent "the *whole* Biblical witness", and he will be inclined to surmise that "the common Anglican notion of our identity with Christ in life and function" is rooted as much in St Paul as in "a semi-speculative theory as to the purpose of the incarnation".

It is also questionable whether he has given full weight to the criticisms of these writers *from within the Church of England* itself. He has admittedly revealed the shocking paucity of evangelical theology on this theme over the past two generations. But he should at least have cited the Report *The Fullness of Christ* and the work of Canon Dillistone.

One cannot end without regretting that a book like this, which

is designed primarily for export, should combine such excellence of treatment with a slipshod carelessness, especially on initials and proper names, which is almost unbelievable. Apart from a liberal ration of misprints and the remark that Dr Temple was "Professor of Philosophy at Oxford" and "crowned Archbishop of Canterbury", we have at various places: Franklin (*aliter* Frederik) D. Maurice (a nice example of an American association of ideas), J. T. Illingworth, F. H. M. Myer, B. R. Streeter, E. G. Hoskyns, E. J. Bishnell, W. S. Boycot, F. H. Hicks (*aliter* Hick), J. B. Cobham, B. Bosanquett and H. L. Liddon. Finally, A. R. Vine is not an Anglican.

CLARE COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE. J. A. T. ROBINSON.

TUDOR PRELATES AND POLITICS, 1536–58. By Lacey Baldwin Smith. Princeton University Press (London: Geoffrey Cumberlege). £2.

Industrious Americans and Frenchmen have stolen a good deal of honey from the hive of Anglican historiography, but it is a pity that this important contribution to Tudor studies was published abroad. Although every library of English Church history should buy it, its price is high by English standards for 340 pages. The author, who teaches history at Princeton University, is tempted to recapitulate chronology which was mother's milk for English students, and such students will be able to catch him out on one or two minor points, for his understanding of English institutions is not certain when he leaves his sources. For example, evidence in the college archives supplements the present chapter on the universities in the 1520s, and Mr A. B. Emden's dictionary of Oxford graduates, almost complete in MSS, corrects the impression, left by Mr Smith, that before Cambridge took to German theology the universities were backwaters in the national life. Again, in discussing economic ills (e.g. on p. 276), Mr Smith pays too much attention to such minor causes as the enclosures and Tudor bureaucracy, and too little to the price-rise. But when within his sources, Mr Smith writes history as impressive as that other Princeton book, J. A. Muller's *Stephen Gardiner and the Tudor Reaction* (1926).

For, in an age sadly conscious of the ravages of idealism, the defence of the middle-of-the-bench, safety-first bishops bears both repetition and the lively illustration made possible by Mr Smith's fresh researches. From 1 June 1533, when Stephen Gardiner, "Wily Winchester", escorted Anne Boleyn to her coronation in the Abbey, to 15 January 1559, when, in the same Abbey, Owen Oglethorpe, soon to be deprived of his see of Carlisle for Popery, crowned Queen the child who during the former ceremony had been in the first Queen's womb, the English bishops had a hard time of it. Not only were they burdened by the routine of government, as well civil as ecclesiastical, but they were exposed to royal inconstancy and on either side to fanaticism scornful of order and peace. Mr Smith is chiefly interested in those twenty-two bishops appointed by Henry VIII who may fairly be labelled "conservative", and seeks to show why the legal and humanistic traditions, common to the majority of these bishops in their youth, were replaced by an intolerant authori-

tarianism. This is a different problem from the consistent Popery of the author of *Utopia*: for More went to the block on behalf of Petrine theory, while the leaders of the Henrician conservatives deprived of their sees under Edward VI were Gardiner, Henry's apologist, and Bonner, Thomas Cromwell's factotum. The answer to the puzzle, as elaborated by Mr Smith, depends upon the recognition of the fear of revolution which, after crippling such large parts of the mind of the sixteenth century, left to posterity the tragedies of Shakespeare. Just as Luther and Melanchthon were thrown into reaction by the Wittenberg riots and the Peasants' War, so the Episcopal civil servants who had served the Henrician schism from Rome later saw an intimate connexion between Evangelical theology and the increase in crimes of violence. Nicholas Heath, who had been given a see by Cromwell as a reformer but who had then served Mary as Chancellor, spoke for the vanished Bench when opposing the 1559 Act of Supremacy: "by our leaping out of Peter's ship, we must needs be overwhelmed with the waters of schism".

That ship, then, seemed to many the ark. But Pole was not alone among the humanists on board in questioning his captain's orders, and other humanists put their faith in other vessels. Indeed, it may be questioned whether Mr Smith is wholly right to say that Henrician humanism had no future in 1559. Professor Neale has recently suggested that Elizabeth I wished to restore her father's ecclesiastical settlement, including the maintenance of a proportion of conservative bishops such as Heath; and, although the Queen failed to carry the Commons, the compromise reached did protect many of the seed-ideas of the Henricians, in time producing in Hooker and Laud a humanism not wholly unlike that studied by Mr Smith. It is in regard to this destiny of humanism in the English Church that studies of Tudor education and economics assume special significance. The revival of humanism could not precede the revival of Oxford; scholarship as well as sanctity suffered while economic pressure tempted Crown and gentry into the spoliation of the Church's dignities.

Mr Smith's appendices include genealogical information supplementing published sources, and also a lucid table showing the careers of the bishops whom he has interpreted to us with learning and imagination.

All Souls College,
Oxford.

D. L. Edwards.

The History of Ridley Hall, Cambridge. Volume II. By F. W. B. Bullock. Cambridge University Press. 26s. (Copies obtainable only from the Principal, Ridley Hall, Cambridge.)

Dr Bullock's first volume, which appeared twelve years ago, traced the history of Ridley Hall down to 1907, giving an account of the

foundation of the college and the work of Bishops Moule and Drury, the first two Principals. The present work covers the principalships of Dr Tait and J. P. S. R. Gibson and gives a very brief account of the five years when S. F. Allison (now Bishop of Chelmsford) was Principal, thus bringing the story down to 1951.

In the preface to Volume I (p. xv) Dr Bullock makes quite plain the plan he has adopted. His aim, he says, is "a detailed narrative mainly from the official angle, i.e. that of the Council and of the staff", the author's personal opinions are not obtruded; what matters is that the Principals and others should be allowed to speak for themselves, and the reader left to draw his own conclusions. His main sources, therefore, are Council Minute Books, the Chapel Register, reports of reunions of old students, and *The Battlement*, which is the college magazine, founded in 1931 by Dr Bullock himself. The result is that the aim of letting Tait and Gibson speak for themselves is to a certain extent achieved, the contemporary record being filled out by a judicious selection of comments by friends looking back on the work and character of these two men.

However, the real weakness of the book lies in the plan adopted. Writing from "the official angle" seems to involve a complete neglect of any but official correspondence, yet it is surely in the private letters which a Principal sends to his staff and former students that the real clue to a college history is likely to be found; not every Principal completely lays bare his heart at every bi-annual Council meeting. It also means there is considerable danger of losing historical perspective and of failing to distinguish between what is of permanent and what is of passing interest. It is here that Dr Bullock's book fails. For instance, the visit of Gandhi and C. F. Andrews in 1931 receives a photograph and a short sentence (p. 182), whereas whole paragraphs are devoted to the names of men who were scholars or exhibitioners of their colleges. One would like to have known what Gandhi thought of Ridley and what Ridley thought of Gandhi. Full lists are given of Ridley bishops, but no attempt is made to ask, or answer the question, why this particular college has been asked to provide so many. Further, while no real assessment is made of the contribution of Ridley in training men for the ministry in the context of the first half of the twentieth century, the book is cluttered up with details of no historical significance, such as whether it was wet or fine for a students' reunion, who attended, who sent apologies for absence, who contributed to the discussion and who read the Lessons in Chapel. Whereas the Council Minute Book is a suitable repository for facts about heating systems, the installation of electricity and details of college plumbing, a college history is not. The fundamental fault of this large book is that it is far too narrowly conceived.

In spite of this limitation and of the criticisms made it is still true that many old Ridleians will find the pages devoted to their time and to that of their friends both diverting and informative, especially if they are prone to use Crockford for entertainment as well as reference.

"Somewhat ponderous" is how Dr Bullock himself describes his first volume; the same description might be applied to the present work, which lacks any counterpart of the excellent introduction of its predecesor, with its invaluable survey of theological education before 1875. In this survey Dr Bullock does not eschew interpretation and thus history rather than chronicle emerges. It is to be hoped that a shorter but more interpretative history of Ridley may yet be written.

St Aidan's College, Birkenhead. Michael Hennell.

Unwilling Journey: A Diary from Russia. By Helmut Gollwitzer. Translated by E. M. Delacour. S.C.M. Press. 16s.

There are a few people who can afford not to read this book. They are those whose horizon is bounded by the Dover Straits and the North Sea; who therefore cannot regard the people of Germany or of Russia as real, or share their struggles and pains. For the rest of us, however, this is a penetrating document of human living in our world. It is an introduction to our neighbours who live in places which lie for most of us in the shadow world of evil spirits—the Nazi army, the prison camps, the indoctrination centres, and the endless plains of Soviet Russia. It is compulsory instruction for our intercessory prayers. This book is the only record of prison experience under the Soviets, known to the reviewer, that has been written with that freedom from hate and from illusion, with that penetrating concern for the life of each human being no matter which side he was on, which flows from Christian faith and prayer.

Professor Helmut Gollwitzer, now at the University of Bonn, followed Niemöller in the Church of St Anne, Berlin-Dahlem, in 1937 when the latter was arrested, following a career as a Student Christian Movement secretary. He soon established a reputation for profound preaching and writing. He was Barthian in theology, left-wing socialist in politics, and a vigorous supporter of the Confessing Church. During the war he was drafted as an ordinary soldier, and the story which he tells in this book starts as the war ends. It carries him through surrender, two years of hard labour on starvation rations in a forest prison camp, nearly two years of special indoctrination in a camp for favoured prisoners near Moscow, and a final year in the asbestos mines of the Ural Mountains.

Gollwitzer went to Russia with an open curious mind and with a certain hope. He was profoundly convinced that the judgment of God was in Germany's defeat, and that the leading of God was behind his imprisonment. The title of the book in German is taken from Jesus' words to Peter in John 21. 18: ". . . another shall gird thee, and carry thee whither thou wouldest not". Gollwitzer would want it made clear that the theme of his book is here. He describes human unwillingness in its fullness. There is nothing more senseless, more arbitrary in playing with human fate, more indifferent to the human spirit, than Russian methods of dealing with their prisoners

(or, indeed, their own people who, as the book stresses again and again, are basically no better off). Yet even there God's hand leads. Those who trust in and seek that leading find tasks to do, fulfilment for their lives, discipline against demoralization and despair, until death, or release, sets the seal of God's grace on a life in his service. It is typical, however, that Gollwitzer nowhere covers reality with pious phrases such as these. He describes the events and the people around him in full realism. He describes the faith and lack of faith in their lives. He describes his own struggles to believe and to live accordingly. This is a great document because it is human reality, seen whole, by a man of faith.

Gollwitzer emerged from his experiences a thorough, and somewhat disappointed, realist about Russia. The book contains records of his struggles with Communist believers and with his own mind, almost blow by blow as they took place, especially in the indoctrination camp. This section is a mine of personal portraits of Communists, half-Communists, and anti-Communists. In each case they are portraits in depth. The thought and argument is presented against the background of the human being behind them—his past, his fears, his realizations, and his spiritual needs. With the same sensitive mixture of realism and charity, Gollwitzer tries to portray the human side of the whole Soviet system. He is not an "expert". No statistics adorn his reflections. But there is wisdom and concern here which every student of Russia and every reader of the newspaper will do well to absorb into his orientation to the Soviet World.

New York. Charles C. West.

SHORTER NOTICES

La Preuve Réelle de Dieu. Étude critique. By J. Defever, S.J. Bruxelles: L'Édition universelle. Paris: Desclée de Brouwer. N.p.

This difficult but penetrating book may be described as an attempt to steal the thunder of the existentialists on the basis of the highly subjectivist interpretation of Thomism which is associated with the school of Fr Maréchal of Louvain. The primitive datum of experience is that of "the intelligence grasping itself in its knowledge of a sensible object". The object is the real, and not merely ideal, final cause of the intellectual act; but at the same time it limits and checks it. From this double fact the author argues for the real validity of the principle of causality and for the existence of an ultimate self-existent transcendent Being in which the intellectual act finds its intelligibility and its satisfaction. The argument is closely woven and for its full appreciation requires more knowledge than most English readers will possess of the thought of the Louvain school and of the continental existentialists. Two points may, however, be singled out for special notice. One is the use which the author makes of Maréchal's distinction between signification and represen-

tation in discussing the doctrine of analogy. The other is his assertion that, although God exists *sans moi*, he does not exist *pour moi sans moi*; in this way by a subtle concession to the existentialists the sting is drawn from their atheistic subjectivism and an explanation is given of the fact that, while (as is alleged) the argument for the existence of God is valid on purely intellectual grounds, its acceptance as an ingredient of the life of the existential subject is impossible without a moral exercise in which is involved the loving activity of the will.

E. L. Mascall.

Christ Church,
Oxford.

Towards an Understanding of the Gospels. By E. Smalley. Epworth Press. 6s. 6d.

The Disciple who wrote These Things. By H. E. Edwards. James Clarke and Co., 12s. 6d.

The Writings of St Luke. By R. Koh. Diocesan Literature Committee, Hong Kong. 3s. 6d.

Mr Smalley's work is interesting in that he tries to bridge the gap between the theologian proper and the ordinary Christian layman. The book has its origin in talks to a group of such laymen, and avoids many of the well-known pitfalls of such "simplified" teaching. The chapter on the general background of the Gospels may be especially valuable as a guide to the inexperienced teacher, giving as it does a concise review of the pagan and Christian, civil and religious atmosphere in which the Church came to write her Gospels. A short chapter on the Synoptic structure is followed by a detailed estimation of the separate values and viewpoints of each of the three evangelists, that of Luke being both instructive and full. We then consider the Fourth Gospel, in a chapter in which the circumstances of time of the first century are outlined, and the different atmosphere of the Gospel illustrated by comparison with the Synoptics. Finally there is an analysis of the Spiritual Message of St John, clearly and readably set out in a way which not only increases knowledge but also never forgets that Christianity is a religion and a life, not merely a subject for study. This is a book which a young Christian should be encouraged to read, with the help and further instruction of his own minister.

By contrast Mr Koh and Canon Edwards have written for the scholar. Mr Koh has confined himself to Luke's writings, taking as a basis the Proto-Luke theory of Streeter. After a short chapter on the problems of Luke 3. 1–2, he goes on to suggest that the order of composition may be Proto-Luke, Acts, and then Luke proper. Mr Koh's method of dating Acts before the death of Paul and the Fall of Jerusalem does not allow for the possibility of an intended sequel to Acts which was never written. He considers that the "former treatise" refers to Proto-Luke and not to the full Gospel, which is Luke's last publication. What was included or omitted from Luke was dictated by the necessary adaptation of the evangelist to the

requirements of the place and time of writing. After a close examination of the details of L, Mr Koh suggests that its place of origin is Decapolis, where Luke gathered his material which reflected the local conditions. Mr Koh's conclusions and suggestions are throughout interesting, especially coming from a parish priest in the mission field.

Canon Edwards' work on St John is also full of interesting theory and suggestion, some of it revolutionary. Briefly he maintains that the Gospel is to be dated before the Fall of Jerusalem, is independent of the Synoptics, and is intended as an apology for Christianity to non-believers. He suggests that where comparison of narrative is possible, John is historically more credible than the Synoptics. In support of the early date, John has more parallels with Mark than with the later Gospels. But Canon Edwards does not think that John's divergences can be reconciled with any theory that he used the Synoptic record. These divergences are explained by the suggestions that John wrote for non-believers, and that he was delivering popular reminiscences in lecture form, rather than official Apostolic teaching in catechetical form. Perhaps the fact that John does not depend on Pauline doctrine is rather strained to imply that John and Paul must therefore have been contemporaries. Dating by doctrinal development is a hazardous business. Canon Edwards suggests that the Gospel was delivered as public lectures at Pella, by the Apostle, and about forty years later a selection from the notes of the lectures was published by the Elder John; this accounts for the original character of John and also for the suggested misplacement of certain chapters of the Gospel. One feels that concentration on the historical accuracy of the narrative has led the author to give too little attention to its spiritual content. Each section seems to be laid out to give prominence to a spiritual point, rather than to give factual information. In his additional chapters, Canon Edwards discusses the historicity of the Raising of Lazarus and the events of Holy Week, and also suggests the identification of Mark's "young man" with the disciple who knew the High Priest's house in John.

Altogether the book is easy to read and clearly expressed, but one closes it feeling fascinated rather than convinced.

BICKLEY. HUGH GLAISYER.

JEW AND GREEK. By Dom Gregory Dix. Dacre Press. 12s. 6d.

Drawing, it has been said, is the art of omission and this is true of the historian's sketch as much as of the artist's. The posthumously published essay of Dom Gregory Dix is a drawing in this sense. It must be judged by whether the few appearing lines are in their right places and are the most characteristic for the subject depicted. Of the artistic quality of his work there can be no doubt.

The background of the sketch is the clash between West and East, Greek and "Syriac" civilization. The religious representative of the latter at the beginning of our era is said to be the Jew. We notice the

omission of a figure like Posidonius which shows that the general cleavage was less pronounced, and are worried by the lack of stress put on the uniqueness of the O.T., but from the purely historical point of view Dix's background no doubt marks an important feature.

In the perennial struggle between East and West the time of the early Roman Empire gave a unique political opportunity to the Man who, throughout his earthly ministry, claimed to be the Son of David and King of the Jews, Jesus of Nazareth. This opportunity he used not for conquest but for making his supreme sacrifice on his own terms, forcing both Jews and Romans to combine in the judicial murder of the Son of God. Thus he saved Israel's eternal mission from becoming secularized. This is the most admirable part of Dix's sketch.

From it he draws in lines where sharp contours are not to be found, with an assuredness it is difficult to share. In three great steps, we are told, the Primitive Church was changed into the Catholic Church: A.D. 30–40, the Messiah was proclaimed within Syrian Judaism; A.D. 40–50, the Christian mission to the Jews of the dispersion; A.D. 50–60, the leap to the Greek world.

This scheme appears to smooth over the growing conflicts between Jews and Greeks within the Church in a way which neglects much of the existing evidence. The brilliant description of Paul the rabbinical missionary to the Greeks is in need of a heavier counterpoise in the form of a jealous central authority at Jerusalem on the one hand and a rebellious Christian Gnosis on the other. The repeated reference to Latin elements in Mark (which are rare) makes the silence about his Aramaisms intolerable. If John was the Ephesian Gospel to the Greeks, why did he embody all the anti-Jewish polemics? And there are also minor inaccuracies (e.g. p. 65: the successor of Symeon, Justus of Jerusalem, "one of the myriads of circumcized believers", Euseb. H.E. iii. 35, not "nephew of James").

Unconvincing too is the solution offered to the conflict between Jew and Greek. It is not the revelation of God in Christ Jesus, nor a "life in Jesus", but the sacramental worship of the Catholic Church, according to Dix. This solution, we fear, will be treated with reserve by historians and theologians alike, all the more when it is contrasted with Dix's classical description of Jesus' victory.

St Mary's Vicarage, Birch, Heywood, Lancashire. Arnold Ehrhardt.

Basic Economic Problems. By John Sleeman. S.C.M. Press. 10s. 6d.

This is an elementary economic textbook, well written and with a nicely balanced judgment. The author analyses the characteristics of the free enterprise economy and of planning, shows the shortcomings and dangers of each, and concludes that while overall planning by the State carries with it the danger of undue interference with freedom, there is both room and need for limited State planning through controls and taxation to mitigate the dangers to human liberty from

increasingly monopolistic and large-scale private enterprise and from the inequality of incomes. The author's Christian judgment leads him to think that our present compromise in Britain between freedom and planning is on right lines. A concluding section on Christian economic responsibility covers ground which will already be familiar to readers of the *Christian News-Letter*. Neither the classical authors on moral theology nor the Bible are drawn upon and the argument consequently lacks illumination. The work done by such pioneers as R. H. Tawney and William Temple still stands in this field, awaiting a younger Ernest Barker, with the economic knowledge of a Keynes and the theological equipment of a Maurice to give us an up-to-date work on moral theology as applied to the economic order. A pure economist like Mr Sleeman is handicapped in applying Christian theological concepts to the economic order because of lack of knowledge in these other fields, especially in the field of jurisprudence. It is not really possible to speak relevantly about economic responsibility without reference to the legal instruments by which that responsibility is to be translated into practice. All that can be done is to provide a personal guide for Christians in industry. This the book does, although from the title the reader might expect something wider.

GEORGE GOYDER.

ROTHERFIELD GREYS.

MAKING PRAYER REAL. By L. J. Radcliffe. Abingdon-Cokesbury Press. $4.00.

This is a book which speaks with the authority born of experience. In 250 pages the author covers the whole ground of the prayer life of the individual, beginning with the necessity for prayer and its relation to discipline, and then following the classic pattern of the pilgrimage through the way of Purgation, Illumination, and Union. One of the chief merits of this exposition is the fact that its author can speak in the language of his own generation, while making abundant use of the Scriptures, classics, and modern writings. Many and apt are the illustrations from everyday life which press home the reality of the experiences described. In the section on Contemplation, the author records a conversation with Kagawa on the deep surrender of self in the contemplation of the Passion, in which Kagawa says of our Lord, "He felt the love of the Eternal Father suffering over the aching wounds of the world. He listened to the agony of God, and then he incarnated it. . . . In prayer I listen to the agony of God and then I surrender myself to Jesus" (p. 210). Some readers may miss any exposition of the relation of individual prayer to the corporate worship of the Church in Holy Communion, though there is a brief reference to this on p. 215. This may raise the question whether in fact any book on Making Prayer Real is complete which omits any training in the experience of corporate prayer, not only in the local church but also in the group; the group that meets not only for intercession but also for worship and adoration. If our generation is to learn anew the meaning of community,

it will need to experience, as in the early Church, how the Holy Spirit acts within the life of the group. Perhaps we have been too long content with the training of the individual in "private" prayer without leading him into the richer and fuller experience of the Holy Spirit which is found in the group. Mr Radcliffe will perhaps write another volume devoted to this important theme.

London. Marianne Turner.

Mercy and Sacrifice. By N. Snaith. S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

Genesis I–XI. By Alan Richardson. (Torch Bible Commentaries.) S.C.M. Press. 7s. 6d.

These two books not only illuminate the meaning of the particular passages of Scripture with which they deal; they also provide some kind of answer to the question of the right method of Biblical interpretation. The problem is difficult, and even if readers should share the reviewer's opinion that neither of these methods is entirely satisfactory, that should not lessen their gratitude for these pioneer efforts towards a new homiletical tradition.

Dr Snaith's method is to insist that his readers shall be interested in the questions which concern Old Testament scholars. He is prepared to simplify and to clarify the answers given to the greatest possible extent, but the reader must be interested in the scholarly questions, or he will not get the answers that Dr Snaith has to give. The result is that, provided this book is studied and not merely read, it will yield to the student a living understanding of the Book of Hosea for which (even if some of Dr Snaith's views never command acceptance) he will be very grateful. But the method is not the only one, nor perhaps the best. Should not interpretation be on a basis where the preacher and the theologian can meet, and which is intelligible to the non-specialist? What the scholar gives would then show itself as illuminating within that setting. But how magnificent Dr Snaith's knowledge of the Old Testament is! He is not afraid to venture on what seems true to him, and he brings back a rich harvest authenticated in his own personal experience. At his best—when his answers to the questions which he wants to raise are fully clear to himself—we have pages on the meaning of prophecy (pp. 20–26) which are worth more than many more learned works. When he is not so good, as in the two chapters on sacrifice, we are given an interim report on his thinking, and we shall have to wait for some subsequent publication to learn what his conclusion is. But Dr Snaith gives a living picture of Hosea, and those who study his book will not forget it easily.

Professor Richardson's book on Genesis 1–11 meets a real need. It is a relief to have a book in English which interprets in a positive religious way the early stories of Genesis, while using all the resources of modern scholarship. His method is to stress the difference between what is Biblical and what is unbiblical, and to insist that the Biblical images when discovered are uncriticizable poetry. These Biblical images may be of different kinds, and the different strands

in the writing are fully recognized. These Biblical images also have influenced other parts of the Bible, and one of the valuable aspects of Dr Richardson's book is the way he relates the "parables" of Genesis to the New Testament. But is this absolute gulf between Biblical and unbiblical true? Has Dr Richardson given us the right way of relating the Genesis "parables" to present-day thinking? Is it not possible to explore with great enjoyment the labyrinths of Biblical images without making contact with real life? Is it true to say (p. 66) "human experience is inevitably sinful experience"? Can we be quite sure that the stories are so untainted with the Jewish spirit of the domination of the male or that the writers were so certain that their stories were not to be taken literally? Is the P tradition quite so balanced (p. 25), and in any case ought we not to clothe the naked scientific symbols P and J with literary clothing for general interpretation? In spite of these queries the book may be warmly commended. Professor Richardson has a very readable style, and once launched on his Introduction, readers will stay to the end, and profit by his detailed exposition.

Yorkshire United Independent College, Bradford. H. Cunliffe-Jones.

The Trial of Jesus. By G. D. Kilpatrick. Oxford University Press. 3s. 6d.

In 1931 Lietzmann published his paper *Der Prozesz Jesu*, a typical product of the old German school of radical analysis—logically unjustified in its premisses and perverse in its conclusions. To the refutation of this document Dr Kilpatrick has devoted his lecture: somewhat painfully he arrives at the conclusion that the New Testament narrative is in the main right, and Lietzmann is wrong, though it is suggested, not for the first time, that Mark's account is, from the legal point of view, not complete. There is a lengthy discussion of the question whether the saying of the Jews in John 18. 31 (misquoted as 19. 31) is true, "It is not lawful for us to put any man to death". The evidence against this is not strong, and barely worth careful demolition. For perhaps legal scruples were not the only, nor the strongest, reason why Jesus was not stoned, but crucified.

As can only be expected in the restricted space of a lecture, there are some notable omissions: the Mishna throws light on Jewish trials, especially in its regulations on the Law of Evidence and the Oath of Testimony. The two recent, interesting French studies from an archaeological angle, published in the *Revue Biblique* 1952, reached the lecturer too late for his use. But I should have expected reference to Joseph Blinzler's thorough contribution, also entitled *Der Prozesz Jesu*, published 1951.

There are still unresolved questions about the Trial, and I am sorry not to find discussion of them here—for instance, What is the source of the Evangelists' narratives? Lietzmann's answer, a drastic conclusion, is quite rightly dismissed; but that is all. Other questions are, Why did the authorities go against their declared policy, and

stage the Trial on the eve of the Feast? Was there one, or were there, as I think, two Jewish trials?

It is a pity that the opportunity of this lecture, provided by the Friends of Dr Williams' Library, has not been used to shed new light, or at least to collate the latest views in this country and abroad, on a theme of abiding importance and unique appeal.

BIRMINGHAM. R. G. LUNT.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

BALLARD (2 ALVA STREET, EDINBURGH, 2): T. A. Bowhay, *The Foundations of Life* (10s. 6d.).

BEREAN PRESS: W. E. Sangster, *Doctrinal Preaching: Its Neglect and Recovery* (2s.).

CHURCH HYMNAL CORPORATION (NEW YORK): *Prayer Book Studies I–V* ($3.60).

CHURCH INFORMATION BOARD: W. P. Wylie, *The Confession of Sexual Sin* (9d.); *The Training of God's People* [Handbook prepared for the Church Assembly, Adult Education Council] (2s.).

DACRE PRESS: Gregory Dix, *God's Way with Man* (5s.).

DELACHAUX ET NIESTLÉ (NEUCHÂTEL): Max Thurian, *La Confession* (Swiss frs. 5.90).

EYRE AND SPOTTISWOODE: R. A. Edwards, *The Gospel according to St John* (12s. 6d.).

FABER AND FABER: Nikos Kazantzakis, *Christ Crucified* (15s.); H. Burn-Murdoch, *The Development of the Papacy* (42s.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: D. Martyn Lloyd-Jones, *From Fear to Faith* (2s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: Otto Weber, *Karl Barth's Church Dogmatics* (16s.); Roland H. Bainton, *The Travail of Religious Liberty* (15s.).

MACMILLAN: G. R. Beasley-Murray, *Jesus and the Future* (25s.).

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS: M. de Jonge, *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* (18s.).

METHUEN: Olaf Stapledon, *The Opening of the Eyes* (7s. 6d.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: J. R. Macphail, *The Way, the Truth and the Life* (10s. 6d.).

PATERNOSTER PRESS: A. Rendle Short, *The Bible and Modern Medicine* (6s.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Max Warren, *Revival: An Enquiry* (4s. 6d.); Karl Barth, *Against the Stream* (16s.); Paul Tournier, *A Doctor's Casebook in the Light of the Bible* (16s.); Olive Wyon, *The Altar Fire* (7s. 6d.); H. G. G. Herklots, *The Hope of Our Calling* (4s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Lucy Menzies (Ed.), *Retreat Addresses of Edward Keble Talbot* (15s.); E. Milner-White, *My God My Glory* (10s. 6d.); Ernest Evans, *Tertullian's Tract on the Prayer* [A new edition of the *De Oratione* with introduction, notes and an English translation] (12s. 6d.).

THAMES AND HUDSON: Alan W. Watts, *Myth and Ritual in Christianity* (25s.).

TYNDALE PRESS: John Murray, *The Covenant of Grace* (1s. 6d.); H. L. Ellison, *The Centrality of the Messianic Idea for the Old Testament* (1s. 6d.); J. W. Wenham, *Our Lord's View of the Old Testament* (1s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher